

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Applicant requests favorable reconsideration in light of the arguments and amendments presented herein.

The objection of claims 1, 7, 13, and 18 should be withdrawn. Page 10 and 11 of applicant's specification recites,

The server 108 compares 210 the original data 118 (including the modified data 120) sent by the first workstation 104a with the current data 122. Note that the process 124 need not compare all data fields included in the current data 122 with the original data 118. For example, the process 124 may exclude a time and date field including the current time and date from comparison because the time constantly changes and thus necessarily varies from the original data 118 to the current data 122.

Amended claims 1 recites, “determining if a first portion of the data fields of the other data differs from a corresponding first portion of the data fields of current data included in a current version of a collection of data that corresponds to the other data.” The above cited specification discloses comparing original data 118 with current data 122, i.e. comparing “data fields of the other data” with “data fields of current data.” Claim 1 also recites, “while ignoring differences between a second portion of the data fields of the other data and a corresponding second portion of the data fields of current data included in the current version of the collection of data that corresponds to the other data wherein the second portion includes temporal data...” The above cited specification discloses the process 124 need not compare all data fields included in the current data 122 with the original data 118, i.e. ignoring differences between “a second portion of data fields of the other data” and “second portion of data fields of current data included in the current version.” Claim 1 also cites, “if the first portion of data fields of the other data does not differ, including the modified data in the current data.” This is disclosed in specification page 4, line 11-12, “The server 108 can then incorporate the modified data 120 into the current data 122.” Each element of applicant's claim 1 is disclosed in the specification as discussed above in detail. Therefore, applicant requests that the examiner withdraw the objection to claim 1, 7, 13 and 18.

The examiner states that it is unclear what portion of the specification supports “first and second portion of hidden data.” The specification describes hidden data on page 9, lines 1-8. Additionally, support for the amended elements of claim 18 is disclosed in the specification as described in detail for claim 1. Therefore, applicant requests that the examiner withdraw the objection to claim 18.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC §103

The examiner acknowledges that Ho does not disclose “determining if a first portion of the data fields of the other data differs from a corresponding first portion of the data fields of the current data included in a current version of a collection of data that corresponds to the other data while ignoring difference between a second portion of the data fields of current data included in the current version of the collection of data that corresponds to the other data.” Freivald does not cure this deficiency. Freivald does not disclose, “determining if a first portion of the data fields of the other data differs from a corresponding first portion of the data fields of the current data included in a current version of a collection of data that corresponds to the other data...” Freivald discloses sending notification “when the new signature does not match the most-recent signature and past recorded signatures.”

During Freivald’s comparison process the entire new signature, i.e. webpage, is compared with the entire most-recent signature. The entire new signature is then compared with recorded older versions of the signature. Frievald does not disclose dividing a signature into separate portions during the comparison determination process.

In addition, Freivald’s comparison of signatures does not disclose, “ignoring differences between a second portion of the data fields of current data included in the current version of the collection of data that corresponds to the other data.” Freivald does not teach or suggest ignoring any portion of the signature during the comparison process. As previously discussed, Freivald discloses comparing the entire signature with a most-recent signature and then comparing with older versions. Freivald does not disclose ignoring any portion of the signature.

Applicant : Aaron A. McBride et al.
Serial No. : 09/758,491
Filed : January 10, 2001
Page : 9 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-323001 / P9684

Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 18 to cite "wherein the second portion includes temporal data." Freivald does not teach or suggest the second portion of data fields let alone the second portion including temporal data. Therefore, the 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 7, 13, and 18, these claims have been amended in the same manner as claim 1. Based on the same arguments as applied to claim 1, claims 7, 13, and 18 should be allowed.

With regard to the other claims, since claims 2-6 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, claims 8-12 depend directly or indirectly on claim 7, claims 14-17 depend directly or indirectly on claim 13, and claims 19-21 depend directly or indirectly on claim 18, these claims should be allowed as submitted.

Applicant's discussion of particular positions of the Examiner does not constitute a concession with respect to any positions that are not expressly contested by the Applicant. Applicant's emphasis of particular reasons why the claims are patentable does not imply that there are not other sufficient reasons why the claims are patentable.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-323001.

Applicant : Aaron A. McBride et al.
Serial No. : 09/758,491
Filed : January 10, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-323001 / P9684

Respectfully submitted,

Attorneys for Intel Corporation,

Date: 8-26-03


Andrew R. Martin
Reg. No. 45,413

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20711788.doc